

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending in this application. In the non-final Office Action of November 5, 2008, all pending claims are rejected. With this paper, claims 1, 3-19 and 21-38 are amended, claims 2 and 20 are canceled, and none are added.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-24, 26-27 and 29-38 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jambhenkar et al (U.S. Patent 6,430,405, Jambhenkar hereinafter) in view of Kamimura (U.S. Pub. 2002/0094806, Kamimura hereinafter).

Regarding claim 1, the Office now acknowledged that Jambhenkar does not teach a memory, said memory being adapted to store image data representing at least one predefined icon to be presented in said display so as to indicate receipt of said electronic message; and wherein said controller is adapted to determine a sender of said received electronic message, to match the sender thus determined with the or each predefined icon by way of said association, and to present a matching icon, if any, on said display to indicate receipt of said received electronic message as well as the sender thereof (page 3 of the Detailed Action).

Kamimura is cited for teaching the above features that Jambhenkar fails to teach, and it is Office's position that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Jambhenkar in view of Kamimura.

With this paper, claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 2. That is, the following features are added to claim 1:

wherein said electronic message is of a type having a control data portion and a message data portion, the control data portion includes a message sender identity, and the sender of said received electronic message is determined from the message sender identity.

On page 5 of the Detailed Action, the above added features are asserted as taught by Kamimura in paragraphs [0078]-[0081]. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In the referenced passage, the ‘e-mail address’ and ‘personal data’ appear to be of relevance, see the citation from Kamimura:

[0078] At step 10a, the control unit 100 detects an e-mail address in the received incoming message signal and starts counting a time. The control unit 100 retrieves personal data from the telephone directory 60a corresponding to caller ID information associated with the received incoming message signal. The personal data includes the detected e-mail address. The control unit 100 reads the retrieved personal data.

[0079] At step 10b, the display unit 71 displays images corresponding to the image patterns included in the personal data read from the telephone directory 60a. The displayed images are stored in the image memory 60b.

[0080] Then, these images are displayed on the display unit 71 in the order set in the personal data read from telephone directory 60a. The background color corresponding to the personal data read is used.

[0081] Additionally, the images read are displayed on the display unit 71 in the order set in the personal data in telephone directory 60a. As shown in FIG. 11, the display unit 71 displays the data including the e-mail address and the name of the calling party included in the personal data read while switching the images.

However, Kamimura is silent about any message of a type, which has two data fields, i.e. a message which both has a control data portion and a message data portion, where the control data portion includes a message sender identity, and where any controller or computer is adapted to determine the sender of the received electronic message from the message sender identity. Kamimura only discloses that “the control unit 100 detects an e-mail address in the received incoming message signal” but not how the e-mail address is detected, e.g. that the e-mail is likely associated with the e-mail address – corresponding to the electronic message as claimed – should contain two data fields, namely a dedicated control data portion and a message data portion, where the control data portion includes a message sender identity.

A similar reasoning is applied that neither the "caller ID information" nor the "personal data from the telephone directory" of Kamimura do imply any message of a type, which both has a control data portion and a message data portion, where the control data portion includes a message sender identity.

Therefore, neither Jambhenkar nor Kamimura discloses the added feature of claim 1.

Based on the above, the present invention as defined in amended claim 1 is not obvious over Jambhenkar in view of Kamimura. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claim 1, and all dependent claims thereof, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

Other claims not mentioned in the preceding section are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jambhenkar in view of various other references. In these claims, only claim 19 is independent, and claim 19 is rejected for the same reasoning as set forth in claim 1 (page 10 of the Detailed Action).

Since claim 1 is believed to be patentable for the reasons presented in the preceding section, claim 19 is also patentable. All other claims are also patentable due to their dependency to a patentable independent claim. Applicant respectfully requests the claim rejections under 35 USC 103 be withdrawn and the claims proceed to allowance.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all of the claims of the application are allowable. Applicant's agent urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if anything in the present response is unclear or unpersuasive.

Respectfully submitted,



Shiming Wu
Agent for the Applicant
Registration No. 56,885

Date: 2/5/2009
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
Tel. (203) 261-1234